

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-87 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 6, 11 and 12 have been canceled without prejudice to Applicants pursuing these claims in a related application. Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 14, 26, 38, 50, 62 and 77 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification and the claims as filed. In particular, support for the amendment to claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8 and 10, which have been rewritten in independent form, can be found in original claim 1. Claims 14, 26, 38, 50, 62 and 77 have been amended to correct an informality. Accordingly, these amendments do not raise an issue of new matter, and entry thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicants bring to the Examiner's attention co-pending application serial No. 10/040,895.

Applicants appreciate the indication by the Examiner that claims 13-87 are allowable.

### **Objection to the Claims**

Applicants appreciate the indication by the Examiner that claims 2, 3, 5 and 7-10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8 and 10 have been rewritten in independent form. Claim 9 depends from claim 8. It is respectfully requested that the objection to these claims be withdrawn, which should place claims 2, 3, 5 and 7-10 into condition for allowance.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The rejection of claims 1, 4, 6, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Corpet et al., Nucl. Acids Res. 28:267-269 (2000), Henikoff et al., Nucl. Acids Res. 28:228-230 (2000), or Murzin et al., J. Mol. Biol. 247:536-540 (1995), is respectfully traversed. Applicants maintain, for the reasons of record, that these claims are novel over Corpet et al., Henikoff et al. or Murzin et al. Nevertheless, to further prosecution, these claims have been canceled. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been rendered moot by the

cancellation of these claims and, accordingly, respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1, 4, 6, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly anticipated by Apweiler et al., Nucl. Acids Res. 29:44-48 (2001), or Bejerano et al., Bioinformatics 17:927-934 (2001), is respectfully traversed. Applicants maintain, for the reasons of record, that these claims are novel over Apweiler et al. or Bejerano et al. Nevertheless, to further prosecution, these claims have been canceled. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims and, accordingly, respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments and remarks herein, Applicants submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance and respectfully request a notice to this effect. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent if there are any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

April 29, 2004

Date



**Agent Name** Deborah L. Cadena  
**Registration No.** 44,048  
**Telephone No.:** (858) 535-9001  
**Facsimile No.:** (858) 535-8949

McDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY  
4370 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 700  
San Diego, California 92122